

Humorous Department

Hadn't Served It Before.—Once a short little woman and her tall husband went to a cafe of the cheaper sort for dinner.

"Will you have oysters?" asked the husband, glancing over the bill of fare.

"Yes," said the little woman, as she tried in vain to touch her feet to the floor. "and, Henry, I want a hassock."

Henry nodded and as he handed his order to the waiter, said: "Yes, and bring the lady a hassock."

"One hassock?" asked the waiter, with what Henry thought more than ordinary interest, as he nodded in the affirmative. Still the waiter did not go, but brushed the table cloth with a towel and re-arranged the articles on it several times, while his face got very red.

Then he came around to the husband's side, and, speaking in a whisper, said: "Say, mister, I haven't been here long, and I'm not on all these things. Will the lady have the hassock broiled or fried?"

Revenge.—A busy housewife came into the sitting room with a determined look in her eyes.

"I really shall have to punish those children," she began.

"What have the little beggars been up to now?" asked father, looking up from his newspaper.

"Why, they've made a mess of my sewing machine," explained his wife. "Needles, reels of cotton, scissors—everything has been hidden away in the most unexpected places. It is really exasperating."

Her husband laid down his paper and smiled benignly.

"I did it," he said calmly. Then, in answer to a questioning look, he went on: "You tidied up your desk so thoughtfully the other day that I thought it only fair to return the compliment. I tidied up your sewing room."

Her First Concern.—The waitress was pretty and conscious of the fact. The diner was frivolous and forward.

"Pretty tough to be penned up here on a nice day like this," the diner observed.

"Yes, sir."

"You are too good looking to be doing this work."

The girl raised her brows.

"Have you never thought of bettering your condition?"

"Oh, yes."

"It's awfully warm in here."

"Uh, huh."

"Don't you suffer from the stuffy atmosphere?"

Half closing her bright eyes and assuming a pensive air the girl replied:

"No; only from the hot air."

Did He Put His Foot In?—An English soldier, a member of the second South Staffordshire regiment, says that one bitterly cold night in the early spring, he and his mates came out of the trenches. They were billeted in a barn, where they were packed in very close.

"Though numb with cold, we were soon asleep," said the soldier in telling the incident. "I was awakened in the night by one of our chaps trying to put his boots on. After he had been trying for a minute or two, I heard the fellow next him say:

"What the — are you doing?"

"Putting my boots on," was the reply.

"Well, that's my foot, you fool!"

He Knew the Reason.—There were introductions all around. The big man stared in a pickled way at the club guest.

"You look like a man I've seen somewhere, Mr. Blinker," he said. "Your face seems familiar. And a funny thing about it is that I remember I formed a strong prejudice against the man who looks like you; although I'm quite sure, we never met before."

The little guest laughed softly.

DRINKING ITS DESTRUCTION

Rum Demon Is England's Greatest Enemy.

HABIT EXTENDS TO ALL CLASSES.

Lloyd-George, Greatest of Modern Statesmen, Sees the Trouble and is Doing What He Can to Avert Disaster—Already Set in Its Ways, Great Empire is Unwilling to Reform.

Rev. A. C. Dixon, in S. S. Times.

Two years ago, as I was waiting for a train on the platform of a London railway station, my eyes fell upon a bulletin-board by the British Women's Temperance association, which read about as follows:

1. The British spend more for drink every year than they pay for taxes.

2. The annual drink bill of Great Britain is more than the value of all its horses.

3. The annual cost of drink in Great Britain is greater than the rentals of all its properties.

These statements were so astounding that I mentioned them in a sermon the following Sunday evening, and asked if they were true. "No, they are not!" answered a deacon, with great emphasis. But investigation proved that they were substantially correct.

Drink is eating the vitals out of the British nation. A few days ago, in this western, women and children in Great Britain, announced in parliament that there had been 139,000 casualties in the British army since the great war began, which meant that about 40,000 had been killed, while about 100,000 had been wounded, taken prisoners, or were ill in hospitals.

Mr. Lloyd-George had just declared that "England has three great enemies, Germany, Austria and Drink," saying that the liquor traffic was to be feared more than German submarines. He might have gone further and said that drink was doing as much mischief in the way of killing people as German submarines, bombs and bullets combined; for while German submarines, bombs and bullets were killing 40,000 soldiers, drink was killing about 40,000 men, women and children in Great Britain. Statistics show that more than 50,000 people in England, Scotland and Ireland die annually as the direct result of drink. It is counted an honor to be killed on the battlefield, fighting for one's country; but what honor in being killed by drink? After the war we shall meet, and praise the brave soldiers who gave their lives for a great cause; but who praises the people whose lives are destroyed by alcohol? Mothers, wives, sisters and sweethearts will listen with grateful joyful hearts, even through their tears, as they hear the praises of their loved ones killed in battle; what mother, wife, sister, or sweetheart is thankful and joyful that their loved ones were slain by drink?

The world was shocked by the sinking of the "Lusitania," with a loss of about 1,100 passengers, but it makes little impression to be told that more than 1,500 people are killed by drink in Great Britain every two weeks. If these 1,500 dying drunkards could be placed in one room, with a record of their diseases and sorrows on account of drink posted above each and heralded to the world, the tale would be far more terrible than the sufferings of the "Lusitania" victims.

A bill some years ago, was engineered through parliament permitting grocers to sell alcoholic liquors with their foodstuffs, thus making it easy for women to secure drink. They have drunk in private until the appetite has become fixed and inflamed. Now they are coming into the open, and it is not an uncommon thing to see saloons full of women jostling men before the bar; and as the law forbids small children entering saloons, women stand in groups on the sidewalks, often with babies in their arms, drinking themselves drunk. It is appalling to think of what a generation of drunken mothers will give to the future.

There is Total Abstinence societies in Great Britain which have done excellent work, and the ranks of total abstainers have been increased during the noble career of King George and Lord Kitchener, but the spasm of total abstinence which followed the proclamation of the king that alcoholic liquors should not be served in the palace during the war seems to have subsided. Hotels are serving liquors as freely as ever. The saloons are crowded with soldiers and civilians. One can hardly walk on the streets of London without seeing drunken soldiers. I saw last Saturday night a group of soldiers, each one with a young woman hanging on his arm, staggering along the sidewalk together, singing some music hall ditty at the top of their voices, looking as if they had been through a mill, beyond the consciousness of decency.

As to prohibition, it was scarcely a subject for serious consideration before the war began. The drink traffic has such a hold upon the leaders in church and state that even temperance advocates for the most part have thought prohibition impossible, if desirable. They have been content to plead for the early closing of shops and the exclusion of children at all hours. I am told that several years ago a list of church dignitaries who had invested interests in the manufacture and sale of drink was published in the daily papers, but nothing came of it except a storm of protest against the "moderators" who published it.

However, good sense has been growing; and when it was announced that the tsar of Russia had closed the vodka shops of that great empire, the temperance people of Great Britain began to clamor for a similar measure. A popular response was so universal that we began to hope that the government would be compelled to yield to it. Inverness, in Scotland, which has been noted for its drunkenness, voted 6,000 to 7,000 for prohibition during the war.

The fact that the manufacture of munitions of war was seriously hindered by the drunkenness of workmen aroused the government, and it looked as if everything were moving in the direction of the desired object. But, strange to say, the declaration of the king and Lord Kitchener in favor of total abstinence during the war gave a setback to the prohibition movement. Even the drink men could now see that self-denial after the king's noble example was better for them than compulsory closing of saloons.

This did not satisfy clear-headed and conscientious statesmen. Lloyd-George, the struggle, the havoc which the drink traffic continued to make among soldiers and workmen, and they were convinced that nothing less than prohibition during the war would remedy the evil.

Lloyd-George suggested that the government buy the whole drink business, though it would have cost the enormous sum of \$900,000,000, and then they could do as they pleased with it. He appears toward the war to make it pay more toward the war expenses, though we have no doubt that he had in view the nobler purpose of following Russia's example and abolishing it, when once it belonged to the government. Be that as it may, the advocates of the drink traffic would not consent to any measure that seemed to threaten their idol. There were long and numerous meetings of the cabinet, until finally Lloyd-George consented to present a compromise measure, placing a high tax on whisky and wine. Already at the beginning of the war he had consented to the principle of high license by increasing the tax on beer, and the saloon keepers over London had in their windows placards urging everybody to be patriotic and drink beer, so as to help defray the expenses of the war. It is difficult to make the English prohibitionists see that high license is a bulwark around the traffic, and the higher the license the better the manufacturer and seller like it, for it enriches their business in public opinion by making it appear to be a necessity for the sake of revenue.

When the question was brought before parliament, John Redmond declared that one of the greatest industries in Ireland would be ruined by the high tax on whisky, and the cry was raised that the government was now violating its pledge that no "contentious" legislation should be introduced during the war. The government, of course, meant that no legislation of a politically contentious character should be introduced; and the drink question had never been a political question at all; but those who were financially interested began to make it a contentious question by protesting against prohibition or high taxation. All other questions, even Home Rule in Ireland, must give way to the great issue involved in the war-struggle for national existence; but when the drink traffic is in danger, even the public safety must be jeopardized in order to save it from harm. Lloyd-George recently intimated in a public address that parliament was overruled by Irish publicans and distillers. The shame of it is keenly felt by the people, and there is a day of reckoning.

We hope that the question has not been finally settled. Not a few earnest souls feel that Great Britain has a controversy with Great Britain for her compromising spirit in dealing with this gigantic evil, and they fear that victory will not come to her arms until she has repented of her national crime; while others, who have no fear of God before their eyes, are equally convicted that the government is pursuing a suicidal policy in permitting the drink traffic to debauch the army and hinder the manufacture of war munitions. The war has certainly thrust the subject of prohibition before the people of Great Britain as it could not have been done in normal times; and when the war does close the temperance forces will find themselves on a vantage ground for pressing the battle in the future. This makes them thank God and take courage.

London, England.

THE WOOLEN SACRIFICE

While Soldiers Fight Women and Children Freeze.

"Wool, wool, wool! Everybody here is talking wool. Everybody is collecting all the old woolen goods they can find in their houses and shipping them to committees, who send them to the mills to be remade into woolen yarn. No old wool is going to waste. Eighteen million pairs of woolen stockings for the soldiers are called for; 3,000,000 woolen head-covers and 1,000,000 woolen mufflers."

So reads a dispatch from northern Italy. These supplies are only for one army, and these contributions are from only one nation.

It is a mere hint of what is going on all over Europe. And the Italian people are making the sacrifice for the first time. The people of France, Belgium, Germany, England, Russia, Austria and Serbia, and even of the neutral nations adjoining them, did it last winter, and are doing it again. They have to do it year after year, and the year after, with the stock of warm clothing ever scarcer.

The able-bodied men of Europe will be warmly dressed and well shod this winter. They must be to stand in the cold trenches. But for the women and children of a continent there will be few woolen stockings and woolen shawls and woolen mufflers. Such wool as they wear will be mostly shoddy.

There will be few warm garments of any sort left among tens of millions of the poor. There will be little fuel, too, in most of the homes, to make the lack of winter clothing tellable. Only here, in peaceful America, will there be warmth and comfort. And how long before we shall be giving up our woolen garments?

The women and children—they pay the price. They always do. The sacrifice of wool for the soldiers simply tells the old story of wars since the beginning.—Augusta Chronicle.

MANNING AND MCLAURIN

By Working Together They Can Perfect Warehouse Situation.

Governor Manning and Commissioner McLaurin have done well to discuss together the advantages of a warehouse system and the legislation necessary to perfect it. The need exists and the legislation should be had. Governor Manning is practical and an excellent business man. He applies the cold test of reason and experience to consideration of the necessity of state-owned warehouses, but likewise the necessity of guarding the receipts in such a manner as to give confidence to the public. Only by such a system can there be even a measurable relief from the unfortunate condition of a one-crop commodity.

The real relief will come when our farmers raise at home, as they soon will, all that is necessary to feed their families and the nearby communities. Then cotton becomes a crop which can be sold in the state warehouse and sold when there is a demand at a fair price. Then will there be independence.—Greenville Piedmont.

STICK TO THE FARM

Governor Manning Gives Advice to Cherokee Farmers.

Laurens Advertiser.

The Advertiser has received the following correspondence from the office of Governor Manning, which it deems of such importance as to justify its publication in full:

From the Governor's Secretary.

Dear Sir:

I hand you the enclosed copy with the request that, if you agree with me that same will prove of interest to your readers, you run same in your issue.

It is the policy of this office to keep in close touch with the people on all public matters, and we know of no better plan than that of keeping the public informed of the doings of the governor's office through the newspapers of the state.

Respectfully,

O. K. LaRouque,
Secretary to the Governor.

September 17, 1915.

From a Cherokee Farmer to Governor Manning.

Gaffney, S. C., Sept. 11, 1915.

Hon. R. I. Manning, Governor,
Columbia, S. C.

Dear Sir:

I take pleasure in writing you today, the object being as to whether or not it would be advisable for a man of seven in the family, consisting of four boys and one girl, my wife and self, living in a nice location, on rented land, in a good position of farming and moving to town.

I ask you as a personal friend of mine to give this letter consideration. The ages of my children range from 17 to 7. By moving to the city I would have better educational advantages, and it is my whole desire to give my children a fair education. Please give me a few minutes of your time advising me as to what is best for my family and mine. Please give me early news on this important subject, and I will probably be able to help others by having your letter published in our local county newspaper.

I am a poor man and have never accumulated much of this world's goods.

Hoping you will give this letter your immediate consideration, I remain, as ever,

Your friend,
(Signed) M. Turner Phillips.

Mr. M. Turner Phillips, Rep.
R. F. D. 2, Gaffney, S. C.

Dear Mr. Phillips:

I received your letter several days ago and have given the question which you propose careful and thoughtful consideration. I appreciate your desire for the educational advancement of your children, but there are some things which I would like to consider before taking the step you propose. In the outset I must advise you to remain on the farm. The big problems of our state at the present time is to make farm life so profitable and so attractive that it will hold the people in the country and stop the movement into our crowded cities. You say you are a small farmer and have not accumulated much of this world's goods. Years ago I, as a young man, was facing practically the same problem that you are now facing. My choice at that time was the farm. I believe that with the proper effort more money can be made on the farm than in the city. The city has many advantages, but it also has many disadvantages. You must consider, among other things, the extra items of expense. In your farm home you have no electricity bills, no coal bills, no high monthly rentals, no extra expenditure for clothing, and many of the other things which cause a serious setback to our people in the cities; on the other hand you have your firewood, you have your food crops, your hogs, your chickens, and, above all, you have that atmosphere of freedom and independence that cannot be found in the city.

South Carolina is making a constant and wonderful stride in matters of education and in improvements in material life. I have seen many of the schools and the colleges, and I have seen the children of our cities. By this I mean good, sound, practical home-sense education, and these contributions are from only one nation.

It is a mere hint of what is going on all over Europe. And the Italian people are making the sacrifice for the first time. The people of France, Belgium, Germany, England, Russia, Austria and Serbia, and even of the neutral nations adjoining them, did it last winter, and are doing it again. They have to do it year after year, and the year after, with the stock of warm clothing ever scarcer.

The able-bodied men of Europe will be warmly dressed and well shod this winter. They must be to stand in the cold trenches. But for the women and children of a continent there will be few woolen stockings and woolen shawls and woolen mufflers. Such wool as they wear will be mostly shoddy.

There will be few warm garments of any sort left among tens of millions of the poor. There will be little fuel, too, in most of the homes, to make the lack of winter clothing tellable. Only here, in peaceful America, will there be warmth and comfort. And how long before we shall be giving up our woolen garments?

The women and children—they pay the price. They always do. The sacrifice of wool for the soldiers simply tells the old story of wars since the beginning.—Augusta Chronicle.

MANNING AND MCLAURIN

By Working Together They Can Perfect Warehouse Situation.

Governor Manning and Commissioner McLaurin have done well to discuss together the advantages of a warehouse system and the legislation necessary to perfect it. The need exists and the legislation should be had. Governor Manning is practical and an excellent business man. He applies the cold test of reason and experience to consideration of the necessity of state-owned warehouses, but likewise the necessity of guarding the receipts in such a manner as to give confidence to the public. Only by such a system can there be even a measurable relief from the unfortunate condition of a one-crop commodity.

The real relief will come when our farmers raise at home, as they soon will, all that is necessary to feed their families and the nearby communities. Then cotton becomes a crop which can be sold in the state warehouse and sold when there is a demand at a fair price. Then will there be independence.—Greenville Piedmont.

I would like for you to write me from time to time as to just what pro-

PALMETTO CLEANINGS

Current Happenings and Events Throughout South Carolina.

The University of South Carolina began its 1915-16 session Tuesday.

J. F. Turbeville was elected mayor of the town of Turbeville, on Tuesday.

The Spartanburg chamber of commerce is agitating the establishment of a creamery in that city.

Willie Cassey, a 15-year-old negro boy was acquitted in Richland county this week of the charge of attempting criminal assault.

Dibert Jackson, Esq., was elected mayor of Eau Claire, a suburb of Columbia Tuesday, defeating A. M. Wallace 28 to 22.

Arthur Odom and John Odom, white men of Spartanburg, plead guilty to stealing watermelons from the field of a man living near that city this week and were fined \$10 each.

Two white men of Columbia were convicted before the city recorder this week for pulling feathers from the tails of ostriches in a park near the city. They were fined \$10.75 each.

W. McB. Sloan of Columbia, has been appointed state whisky gauger to succeed L. M. Fouché, deceased.

Hon. William Jennings Bryan delivered an address in Columbia yesterday evening.

E. J. Watson, commissioner of agriculture of South Carolina, was re-elected president of the National Drainage congress at the meeting of that body in San Francisco, Cal., this week.

Fire in Charleston this week destroyed the grandstand at the Palmetto racing park and also a number of stables. The property loss was about \$40,000, partly covered by insurance.

Calvin Johnson, a well known negro farmer of Manning, lost a cow valued at \$75, from tick fever this week. The work of tick eradication among cattle has never been prosecuted in Clarendon county.

L. L. Bultman, dispensary auditor, has sent out a letter to all the dispensaries in the state asking for a statement of the amount of liquor on hand. The dispensaries should buy no more liquor. The dispensaries will close on January 1.

Major Carter, a 12-year-old negro boy of Chester, is in a serious condition in a Chester hospital as the result of holding a live cat match to an old shotgun shell. The shell exploded, part of it entering the boy's leg and a portion of it lacerating his fingers.

MARKETING AGENT APPOINTED

Warehouse Commissioner Names Col. T. B. Thackston.

John L. McLaurin, state warehouse commissioner, while in Spartanburg yesterday, announced that he would immediately commission Col. T. B. Thackston of Cedar Spring, as head of the sales department of the state cotton warehouse system. Col. Thackston has accepted the appointment and will be commissioned as "state warehouse agent in marketing."

Mr. McLaurin arrived in Spartanburg yesterday, en route from Atlanta, where he delivered an address Tuesday in the state capitol building, and he had just returned to his establishment of a state warehouse system in Georgia. He left on the Carolina Special yesterday afternoon for Columbia.

When interviewed at the Gresham hotel yesterday morning, Mr. McLaurin said that the matter of providing for a systematic sales department of the cotton warehouse system had been under consideration for several months. He said that he had carefully considered the selection of an official to take charge of the sales department, and had come to the conclusion that no one in this state was better prepared to undertake the work than Colonel Thackston. Col. Thackston has been a continuous and careful student of the marketing system and is thoroughly familiar with the theory as well as the practical application. Col. Thackston will in a few days announce full details of the system of marketing the cotton warehouse system. In discussing this feature of the warehouse system, Mr. McLaurin said that the matter of enabling the farmers to get a fair price for their product was in reality the principal object of the warehouse system. While the storing of cotton wool, and borrowing money upon it until the proper price could be secured, was a fundamental and necessary phase of the purpose, this procedure, in reality, said Mr. McLaurin, a makeshift, as the farmer should be enabled to sell his cotton at a proper price. By this means, the farmer will be assured of the safe storage of his cotton until the market reaches the proper figure, and at the sale of the cotton, the farmer will be able to get a fair price for his product. Mr. McLaurin stated that he had recently received a number of letters from New York cotton brokers, asking him to purchase cotton for them at certain prices, expressing a preference for shipments in 500 or 1,000 bale lots. One firm asked how much cotton would be able to deliver per month.

Mr. McLaurin believes that such a plan will have a strong tendency toward standardizing spot cotton prices in the South Carolina markets. It is a well-known fact that with the same quality of cotton, quotations in different markets vary from 1-1/2 to 2-1/2 cents per pound between various markets in this state. It is the general understanding that the markets in this locality are based upon the New York spots, the price here being only slightly lower than the New York price.

The plan for the marketing of cotton through the state warehouses, it is understood, will be based strictly upon this calculation, and this will tend to the divergence in the local offerings.

Senator McLaurin stopped in Spartanburg yesterday to assist his daughter, Miss Sara McLaurin, in her preliminary arrangements for entering upon a course of study at Converse college. He suffered considerable pain from the morning from an attack of acute indigestion, but was sufficiently recovered to resume his journey during the early afternoon.

Commenting upon his recent statements that some of the bankers were making against the interests of the farmers in the matter of marketing their cotton, Mr. McLaurin declared that he had the proof of his statements in his suitcase, but did not wish to make them public at this time, from a desire not to stir up a spirit of animosity among the people of the state.—Spartanburg Herald, Thursday.

CABINET QUARRELS

Have Been Few in the History of the United States.

The recent precipitate withdrawal of Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan from the cabinet calls attention to the fact that there have been comparatively few American cabinet crises, a situation which shows the strength of the American institution as compared with the cabinets of Europe, says the Baltimore Sun.

There it is a frequent occurrence for a crisis to be projected by one man's attitude, a situation that has resulted in the entire reconstruction of cabinets. France and England have known scores of such instances of wholesale vamping of the portfolios.

Here cabinet disruptions have never occurred. Men have resigned frequently from the presidential boards, but none however, has caused the upset of the cabinet.

There have been a few serious cabinet quarrels, secretaries at odds with the president, and in one case a feud between a president and secretary, but none of quite the phase of the Bryan break.

Of all probably the most interesting was the Stanton affair, when, briefly, Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton was "fired" by President Andrew Johnson, although at first he refused to be "fired," persisted in holding office and gave up only when the collapse of impeachment proceedings against President Johnson rendered his retention in Grant's administration, with the virtually entire resignation of Secretary of War Belknap, Grant was too much the soldier to see the ways of the politicians, and following a period of incessant rumors and counter-rumors he suddenly realized that the war department had been overrun with graft on hundreds of army contracts. Belknap's prompt surrender of his portfolio ended a situation that proved bitter to Grant and eventually caused the defeat of the Republican party.

A somewhat similar situation arose in later years, when another member of the cabinet, and this time a Secretary of war, Secretary Alger, was compelled to step down from the McKinley war cabinet. The embalmers of scandal that involved Comptroller General Egan and the quartermaster department generally, on charges of inadequate and neglectful handling of the supplies of the armies invading Cuba and Porto Rico reacted eventually on the war secretary and he retired a broken man.

But of the three only Stanton's resignation comes the nearest to the Bryan case. Both times were momentous—Bryan's because of the great question, possible war with a foreign country, that precipitated it; Stanton's because of the situation it created, resulting as it did in the only presidential impeachment in our country's history.

Johnson, pulled and hauled in the trying reconstruction days, asked for Stanton's resignation. All of the Lincoln cabinet had held over when Johnson succeeded the martyred president, and there was soon grave internal dissensions. Johnson, first, had not the insight and foresight of Lincoln, to whom the cabinet had become endeared; and worst of all, he did not realize it and lacked the tact to meet the situation.

His greatest trouble was with Stanton. Stanton, over a determined man, brusque and Napoleonic in his decisions, practically refused to tolerate Johnson's methods. Stanton ran with the Republican congressional feeling, and the Confederate states, he went beyond the pale in their secession and must work out a long period of grace before they could be taken into the fold again.

Johnson's position was that the war was merely an extreme and protracted "uprising" with which the president alone should deal and not Congress. The feeling between the two became so acute that days passed without either speaking to the other, though they met frequently in the cabinet.

Finally President Johnson asked for Stanton's resignation. Stanton promptly, almost abruptly, in his brusque, irritating manner, refused to resign.

Johnson thereupon declared him removed from the office and appointed Gen. Grant to act as secretary of war. The tenure of office act, to protect civilian employees from office to summary removal, was not in effect until a short time later. Stanton held the act of Johnson illegal under the act and still refused to give up his office.

And for nearly four months the country had two secretaries of war—Stanton and Grant. Grant was in an especially humiliating position, urged as he was on one hand to oust Stanton from the office of secretary and controlled by a reasonable doubt as to the legality of his own appointment.

Stanton, Grant and Stanton had had several serious frictions in Lincoln's time, when Lincoln tactfully and pointedly made the dominating war secretary realize that Grant was the real head of the army.

The question went before congress when it reconvened in December and there was consternation when the senate, whose prerogative it was to appoint upon presidential appointments, passed a resolution of sanction the ousting of Stanton. This threw things back to their original status and Stanton triumphantly resumed his office.

Johnson then took the bull by the horns and removed Stanton again. The removal during a recess of congress was not considered a very serious contravention of the tenure of office act, but the second action, with congress in session, created a tremendous sensation, and before the country was aroused from its amazement articles of impeachment had been drawn against Johnson.

These articles cited a number of charges against the president, but there was no doubt that the Stanton removal was the crucial one of all. Congress seemed a means of decisive venting its dislike of Johnson, with whom it had been in almost constant embroilment over the reconstruction of the south, and there was a general feeling of satisfaction.

From the Johnson side it was contended that Stanton's removal was merely a means of testing the constitutionality of the tenure of office act, and the second action, with congress in session, created a tremendous sensation, and before the country was aroused from its amazement articles of impeachment had been drawn against Johnson.

These articles cited a number of charges against the president, but there was no doubt that the Stanton removal